

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 6-11, 16-23, 29 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Devine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,402). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to the independent claims. Specifically, applicant has amended the independent claims to at least substantially include the subject matter of former dependent Claims 6 and 8 et al.

With respect to independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, the Examiner has relied on Col. 7, lines 26-47; Col. 11, lines 60-67; Col. 8, lines 1-25; Col. 16, lines 21-34; and Col. 20, lines 52-67 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "identifying a plurality of templates provided based on user input." Specifically, the Examiner has argued that such excerpts teach that a "user has access to various templates including Traffic information templates."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Such excerpts merely disclose "a variety of application specific proxies...including... a Report Manager Proxy...for generating, managing and receiving notification of customized reports including, for example...network traffic analysis/monitor information provided from the Traffic view server 34" (Col. 7, lines 26-47), "user report customization options" (Col. 11, lines 60-67), "data transport mechanisms" (Col. 8, lines 1-25), and "selection and presentation of the Report Requestor display which presents the reporting options to a user" (Col. 16, lines 21-34). Clearly, such teachings do not even suggest "identifying a plurality of templates provided based on user input" (emphasis added), as claimed.

In addition, applicant notes that Col. 20, lines 52-67 from Devine, as relied on by the Examiner, disclose "types of requests that may be initiated by the Report Requestor...[including] 1) Get/Send report template list (GRTL/SRTL)--which request retrieves the list of all standard report templates for all products and is used only to obtain general report information, e.g., report title, description, etc.; 2) Get/Send report template

detail (GRTD/SRTD)--which request retrieves the details of a specific standard report template.” Applicant respectfully asserts that merely disclosing a get/send report template list request that retrieves standard report templates and is used to obtain general report information, in addition to a get/send report template detail request which retrieves details of a specific standard report template, as in Devine, fails to specifically teach “identifying a plurality of templates provided based on user input” (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has argued that Devine teaches applicant’s specific claim language in Col. 20, lines 51-64 “where there is a list of templates that is chosen based on a user request.” In addition, the Examiner has argued that Col. 22, lines 20-52; Col. 10, line 35-50; and Figure 7a “teach a list of templates or reports which are chosen by the user,” where “[t]he user requests a report...receives a list of reports available to him...[and] chooses one of the reports.” The Examiner has further argued that “[r]elating the list of reports after a request from the user to the user teaches the limitation of identifying a plurality of templates based on user input.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 22, lines 20-52 in Devine, as relied on by the Examiner, only discloses that “for each Report Template Category, there will be the list of reports with each entry containing a Report Template Title, a Report Template Description and the Report Template ID,” where “[t]he SRTL message is sent from the StarWRS RM proxy server to the report requester for presentation to the customer” and “[t]he Report Manager creates the RMServerSocket object and sends the SRTL message back to the client.”

In addition, Col. 10, lines 35-50 discloses that “[r]eport management related data is also generated which includes 1) report profiles defining the types of reports that are available, fields for the reports, default sort options and customizations allowed; and 2) report requests defining customer specific report requests including report type, report name, scheduling criteria, and subtotal fields” (Col. 10, lines 41-46). Still yet, the

description of Figure 7a merely teaches that “[o]nce a user is logged on, the Web Server (FIG. 2(b)) requests a current list of authorized applications...[where] a ‘Get User Application Request’ message is communicated to the StarOE server via the backplane which queries the Informix database to obtain a list of authorized applications, i.e., services, for the user,” where such “information is downloaded by a GUI applet that is executed via the Backplane (not shown) and incorporated into the home page that is presented to the user” (Col. 16, lines 3-17).

Clearly, the excerpts from Devine relied on by the Examiner merely disclose a “list of reports with each entry containing a Report Template Title, a Report Template Description and the Report Template ID,” “report requests defining customer specific report requests including report type, report name, scheduling criteria, and subtotal fields,” and that a web server “requests a current list of authorized applications...[which is] incorporated into the home page that is presented to the user.” However, simply mentioning a list of reports that are each associated with a Report Template Title, a Report Template Description and the Report Template ID, in addition to disclosing that a current list of authorized applications may be presented to a user in response to a request by a web server, as in Devine, fails to specifically meet applicant’s claimed “identifying a plurality of templates provided based on user input” (emphasis added), as claimed.

Also with respect to independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, the Examiner has relied on Col. 12, lines 46-67; Col. 16, lines 41-67; Col. 17, lines 34-67; and Col. 18, lines 1-17 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed “querying a database for network traffic information based on the identified templates” (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in the foregoing independent claims). Specifically, the Examiner has argued that such excerpts teach that a “report manager utilizes a database.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that the excerpts relied on by the Examiner merely disclose that a “report manager server additionally utilizes a database 258, such as provided by Informix, to provide accounting of metadata and user report inventory” (Col. 12, lines 46-67), that a “user is enabled to edit an existing report

maintained in the report manager inventory” (Col. 16, lines 41-67) and that “[w]hether creating a new report or editing an existing report, the user is enabled to select customization options” (Col. 17, line 34-Col. 8, line 17).

However, simply disclosing that a report manager server uses a database to provide accounting of metadata and user report inventory, and that a user is enabled to edit an existing report by selecting customization options, as in Devine, does not meet applicant’s claimed “querying a database for network traffic information based on the identified templates” (emphasis added), as specifically claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Col. 7, lines 43-59; Col. 16, lines 39-67; and Col. 17, lines 1-32 in Devine, and has additionally argued that “Figure 7c shows running the report and populating the report.” The Examiner has further argued that “Devine teaches that the report data is gathered based on the template selected or created by the user.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The excerpts from Devine relied on by the Examiner merely teach that “each Intranet server of suite 30 communicates with one or several consolidated network databases which include each customer’s network management information and data” (Col. 7, lines 44-47), and that “[w]hen creating a new report or editing an existing report, the user may enter the desired reporting options including:... the report category, as indicated by menu 359... which includes options for: analyzing traffic, call center, call detail, checking calling frequencies, financial, marketing, monitoring usage, and telecommunications categories for toll-free, Vnet and Vision customers; [and] 3) the report type, as indicated by menu 360... which includes priced call detail data or traffic data options” (Col. 16, lines 46-57). Moreover, Figure 7c in Devine, as relied on by the Examiner, merely shows “presenting a user with report run and save options” (Col. 26, lines 35-36).

However, simply teaching consolidated network databases which include each customer’s network management information and data, in addition to creating a new

report by entering a report category for analyzing traffic, monitoring usage, etc. and by entering a report type which may include traffic data options, and further teaching running a report, as in Devine, fails to specifically meet applicant's claimed "querying a database for network traffic information based on the identified templates" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Further, with respect to the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on Col. 14, lines 26-43 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "populating the templates with the network traffic information" (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in each of the independent claims). Specifically, the Examiner has noted that Devine teaches "information used to fill reports."

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that the excerpt from Devine relied on by the Examiner merely discloses a "GUI Applet enabling user interaction for managing reports" (Col. 14, lines 26-27). Clearly, simply allowing a user to manage reports via a GUI applet, as in Devine, fails to even suggest any sort of "information used to fill reports," as noted by the Examiner, and especially does not teach "populating the templates with the network traffic information," as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Col. 7, lines 39-59 and Figure 7c in Devine to meet applicant's claim language. Specifically, the Examiner has argued that "[t]he Traffic Analysis report runs a report which deals with traffic information."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 7, lines 39-59 simply discloses "network traffic analysis/monitor information provided from the Traffic view server" and that "each Intranet server of suite 30 communicates with one or several consolidated network databases which include each customer's network management information and data." In addition, Figure 7c in Devine, as relied on by the Examiner, merely shows "presenting a user with report run and save options" (Col. 26, lines 35-36).

However, disclosing network traffic analysis/monitor information and consolidated network databases which include each customer's network management information and data, in addition to generally teaching running a report, as in Devine, fails to specifically teach "populating the templates with the network traffic information" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Still with respect to the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on Col. 13, lines 26-41; Col. 18, lines 46-67; and Col. 20, lines 42-50 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein the templates are generated based on a plurality of user-configured parameters including network portions to be reported, a format of the reporting, a time or period, where the network traffic information comes from, what type of network traffic information is used, and to what location the network traffic information is written." In particular, the Examiner has noted that Devine teaches "format types."

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that the excerpts from Devine relied on by the Examiner merely disclose an "Inbox Server component 270 [that] serves as the repository where the completed user report data is stored, maintained, and eventually deleted and is the source of data that is uploaded to the client" (Col. 13, lines 26-41). In addition, the excerpts disclose a "sorts tab [that] enables the user to specify columns to be sorted in an available sorts selection field 391, whether totals are to be made, whether the column data to be provided is in ascending or descending order" (Col. 18, lines 46-67), and further teach that "selection of available standard template reports is based on the user's entitlements" (Col. 20, lines 42-50).

Clearly, simply disclosing a repository where completed user report data is stored, maintained, and eventually deleted and which is the source of data that is uploaded to the client, in addition to allowing a user to specify columns to be sorted, and teaching that a selection of available standard template reports is based on a user's entitlements, as in Devine, fails to even relate to a technique "wherein the templates are generated," let alone specifically teach a technique "wherein the templates are generated based on a

plurality of user-configured parameters including network portions to be reported, a format of the reporting, a time or period, where the network traffic information comes from, what type of network traffic information is used, and to what location the network traffic information is written" (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Figure 7a of Devine in arguing that "Devine shows that the templates or reports are selected from an inventory of reports," where such "selection of a report teaches generating a template."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, applicant respectfully asserts that the description of Figure 7a simply discloses that "[o]nce a user is logged on, the Web Server (FIG. 2(b)) requests a current list of authorized applications...[where] a 'Get User Application Request' message is communicated to the StarOE server via the backplane which queries the Informix database to obtain a list of authorized applications, i.e., services, for the user," where such "information is downloaded by a GUI applet that is executed via the Backplane (not shown) and incorporated into the home page that is presented to the user" (Col. 16, lines 3-17). Additionally, with respect to Figure 7a, Devine teaches "present[ing] the reporting options to a user" (Col. 16 lines 23-24). However, simply obtaining a list of authorized applications, and presenting reporting options to a user, as in Devine, fails to even suggest that "selection of a report teaches generating a template," as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the excerpts from Devine relied on by the Examiner simply do not meet applicant's claimed technique "wherein the templates are generated" (emphasis added), and especially not in the context claimed.

Also in the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has argued that Figure 7b and the associated description in Devine disclose applicant's claimed technique "wherein the templates are generated based on a plurality of user-configured parameters including network portions to be reported, a format of the reporting, a time or period, where the network traffic information comes from, what type of network traffic information is used, and to what location the network traffic information is written," as

claimed. In particular, the Examiner has argued that such disclosure in Devine teaches that “[t]he report is formatted and customized,” and that such “customization information includes report type, data location, scheduling selections, user defined criteria and other options, see column 24, lines 25-50.” Further, the Examiner has argued that “[t]his teaches that the templates are generated based on a plurality of user-configured parameters.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, applicant respectfully asserts that simply formatting and customizing a report, as alleged by the Examiner to be taught in Devine, does not specifically teach that “the templates are generated based on a plurality of user-configured parameters” (emphasis added), as claimed. Second, Col. 24, lines 25-50 in Devine discloses that “[t]his response thus may include the report information having detailed items including: UserReportID (UserID), User's report name (UserName), product (UserProd), Threshold (UserThreshold), User Report Description (UserDescript), Report Columns (UserFields), Report column headings (UserHeaders), and, in addition, customization options with fields indicating, inter alia, columns to display (UserHeaders), user-defined criteria (UserCriteria), a sort order (UserOrder) and scheduling selections (UserSched), the last update of this report (UserLastUpdate) and, the Report status (if adhoc) (UserStatus), etc.,” which clearly does not specifically meet applicant's claimed technique “wherein the templates are generated based on a plurality of user-configured parameters including network portions to be reported, a format of the reporting, a time or period, where the network traffic information comes from, what type of network traffic information is used, and to what location the network traffic information is written” (emphasis added), as claimed.

Also with respect to independent Claim 22, the Examiner has relied on Figure 2, user input, paragraph [0121], paragraph [0079], paragraph [0081], paragraph [0115], paragraph [0126]; and Claim 29 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed “if the network analysis reporting system is operating in the report mode, identifying a plurality of existing templates; [and]...if the network analysis reporting

system is operating in the edit mode, creating a plurality of templates based on user input.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that it seems the Examiner has pointed to excerpts other than those disclosed in the Devine reference. For example, the Devine reference is not noted by paragraphs, but instead is noted by column and line number. In addition, Figure 2 of Devine does not show any sort of “user input,” as suggested by the Examiner, and the Devine reference does not include a Claim 29. Thus, applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance or a proper prior art showing of such subject matter, in the context of the remaining elements.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has failed to respond to applicant’s above arguments. Thus, a notice of allowance or a proper prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

In addition, with respect to independent Claim 23, the Examiner has relied on Col. 14, lines 45-50 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed “validating the parameter file.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt from Devine merely discloses that “[t]o communicate with the StarOE for user security, hierarchy, paging and e-mail, etc. the Report Requestor uses StarOE client Java code,” and that “Report Requestor JAVA applets implementing the above-described report requestor functionality, are downloaded to the...customer's workstation in the form of a cab file after initial login.” However, simply disclosing using Java code to communicate and downloading to a customer’s workstation Report Requestor JAVA applets implementing report requestor functionality, as in Devine, fails to even suggest any sort of validating, let alone “validating the parameter file,” as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Col. 6, lines 25-55; Col. 8, lines 49-67; and Col. 22, lines 1-20 in Devine in arguing that such excerpts from Devine “teach that parameter requested by the client is valid one.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, simply alleging that Devine teaches that a parameter requested by a client is a valid one does not even suggest an actual action is performed, namely validating, as applicant claims. Second, the excerpts from Devine relied on by the Examiner do not teach applicant’s specific claim language. For example, Col. 6, lines 25-55 in Devine only relates to communication protocols, Col. 8, lines 49-67 only relates to firewalls, and Col. 22, lines 1-20 simply discloses “determining that the client has sent a valid message.” Clearly, disclosing communication protocols, firewalls, and determining that the client has sent a valid message, as in Devine, fails to even suggest any sort of validating, let alone “validating the parameter file,” as claimed.

Moreover, with respect to independent Claim 23, the Examiner has relied on Col. 14, lines 50-55 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed “identifying templates in the parameter file.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt from Devine only discloses a “Report Viewer application 215 [that] is a GUI Applet enabling a user to analyze and display the data and reports supplied from the fulfilling servers.” Clearly, only disclosing a GUI applet that allows a user to analyze and display data and reports, as in Devine, fails to specifically teach “identifying templates in the parameter file” (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Col. 20, lines 50-61 and Col. 22, lines 35-49 in Devine in arguing that “Devine teaches that different templates are obtained from different servers and the different templates contain different data.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Simply alleging that “Devine teaches that different templates are obtained from different servers and the different templates

contain different data” does not even suggest a parameter file, let alone “identifying templates in the parameter file” (emphasis added), as claimed.

Still yet, with respect to independent Claim 23, the Examiner has relied on Col. 15, lines 15-65 from Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed “retrieving templates of a second type from a second module.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt simply teaches “associating each set of report data which is downloaded via the Inbox server 270 with a ‘metadata’ report description object, [such that] reports can be presented without report-specific presentation code” (Col. 15, lines 23-26). However, merely disclosing associating report data with a metadata report description object, as in Devine, does not meet applicant’s claimed “retrieving templates of a second type from a second module” (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Col. 20, lines 50-61 and Col. 22, lines 35-49 in Devine in arguing that “Devine teaches that different templates are obtained from different servers and the different templates contain different data.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 20, lines 50-61 in Devine merely discloses “types of requests that may be initiated...and the responses performed by the Report Requestor.” In addition, Col. 22, lines 35-49 in Devine simply teaches that “[t]he SRTL message is sent from the StarWRS RM proxy server to the report requester for presentation to the customer.”

Clearly, Devine only discloses sending a message to a report requestor and that a response is performed by the report requestor, which does not even suggest that “different templates are obtained from different servers and the different templates contain different data” (emphasis added), as noted by the Examiner. To this end, Devine’s disclosure of a response from a report requestor does not meet applicant’s claimed “retrieving templates of a second type from a second module,” especially where “templates of a first type [are retrieved] from a first module,” in the context applicant claims.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Devine reference, as noted above. Nevertheless, despite such paramount deficiencies and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has substantially incorporated the subject matter of former dependent Claims 6 and 8 et al. into each of the independent claims.

With respect to former dependent Claim 6 et al. (now at least substantially incorporated into each of the independent claims), the Examiner has relied on Col. 7, lines 26-47; Col. 11, lines 60-67; Col. 8, lines 1-25; Col. 16, lines 21-34; and Col. 20, lines 52-67 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein the templates include templates of a first type and templates of a second type."

Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpts merely disclose "a variety of application specific proxies...including... a Report Manager Proxy...for generating, managing and receiving notification of customized reports including, for example...network traffic analysis/monitor information provided from the Traffic view server 34" (Col. 7, lines 26-47), "user report customization options" (Col. 11, lines 60-67), "data transport mechanisms" (Col. 8, lines 1-25), and "selection and presentation of the Report Requestor display which presents the reporting options to a user" (Col. 16, lines 21-34). Clearly, such teachings do not even suggest a technique "wherein the templates include templates of a first type and templates of a second type (emphasis added), as claimed.

In addition, applicant notes that Col. 20, lines 52-67 from Devine, as relied on by the Examiner, disclose “types of requests that may be initiated by the Report Requestor...[including] 1) Get/Send report template list (GRTL/SRTL)--which request retrieves the list of all standard report templates for all products and is used only to obtain general report information, e.g., report title, description, etc.; 2) Get/Send report template detail (GRTD/SRTD)--which request retrieves the details of a specific standard report template.” Applicant respectfully asserts that merely disclosing a get/send report template list request that retrieves standard report templates and is used to obtain general report information, in addition to a get/send report template detail request which retrieves details of a specific standard report template, as in Devine, fails to specifically teach a technique “wherein the templates include templates of a first type and templates of a second type (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has referenced Col. 20, lines 50-61 and Col. 22, lines 35-49 in Devine in arguing that “Devine teaches that different templates are obtained from different servers and the different templates contain different data.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 20, lines 50-61 in Devine merely discloses “retriev[ing] the list of all user reports for the report format selected from a user report table.” In addition, Col. 22, lines 35-49 in Devine simply relates to a “standard report template.” Clearly, merely teaching a list of user reports for the report format selected, in addition to a standard report template, as in Devine, fails to meet applicant’s claimed technique “wherein the templates include templates of a first type and templates of a second type” (emphasis added), as claimed.

With respect to former dependent Claim 8 et al. (now at least substantially incorporated into each of the independent claims), the Examiner has relied on Col. 13, lines 26-41; Col. 18, lines 46-67; and Col. 20, lines 42-50 in Devine to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed technique “wherein the templates of the first type and the templates of the second type differ with respect to a format thereof.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpts merely disclose that an "Inbox Server component 270 serves as the repository where the completed user report data is stored, maintained, and eventually deleted and is the source of data that is uploaded to the client user" (Col. 13, lines 26-41) in addition to teaching a "sorts tab [that] enables the user to specify columns to be sorted" (Col. 18, lines 46-67), and the "us[e of] the metadata to determine what a standard report should look like, the customization options the user has, and the types of screens that should be used for the various options," where "the selection of available standard template reports is based on the user's entitlements" (Col. 20, lines 42-50).

However, simply disclosing a repository for completed user report data and as a source of data that is uploaded to the client user, a sorts tab for allowing a user to specify columns to be sorted, using metadata to determine what a standard report should look like, and that a selection of available standard template reports is based on the user's entitlements, as in Devine, fails to specifically teach a technique "wherein the templates of the first type and the templates of the second type differ with respect to a format thereof" (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Office Action mailed 04/10/2008, the Examiner has argued that Figure 7b and the associated description in Devine disclose applicant's claimed technique "wherein the templates of the first type and the templates of the second type differ with respect to a format thereof," as claimed. In particular, the Examiner has argued that such disclosure in Devine teaches that "[t]he report is formatted and customized," and that such "customization information includes report type, data location, scheduling selections, user defined criteria and other options, see column 24, lines 25-50." Further, the Examiner has argued that "[t]he different templates differ in format based on the customization set by the user," which "changes the format of each template."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, applicant respectfully asserts that simply formatting and customizing a report, as alleged by the Examiner to be taught in Devine,

does not specifically teach that the “templates of the first type and the templates of the second type differ with respect to a format thereof” (emphasis added), as claimed.

Second, Col. 24, lines 25-50 in Devine discloses that “[t]his response thus may include the report information having detailed items including: UserReportID (UserID), User's report name (UserName), product (UserProd), Threshold (UserThreshold), User Report Description (UserDescript), Report Columns (UserFields), Report column headings (UserHeaders), and, in addition, customization options with fields indicating, inter alia, columns to display (UserHeaders), user-defined criteria (UserCriteria), a sort order (UserOrder) and scheduling selections (UserSched), the last update of this report (UserLastUpdate) and, the Report status (if adhoc) (UserStatus), etc.,” which clearly does not specifically meet applicant's claimed technique “ wherein the templates of the first type and the templates of the second type differ with respect to a format thereof” (emphasis added), as claimed.

Since the above anticipation criterion has simply not been met by the Devine reference, a notice of allowance or a proper prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

To this end, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The

Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to
Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P067).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC

/KEVINZILKA/

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100